

The Special/Study Meeting of the Troy City Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-Chairman Littman at 7:30 P.M. on Tuesday, May 28, 2002, in the Lower Level Conference Room of the Troy City Hall.

1. ROLL CALL

**Present:**

Littman  
Kramer  
Pennington  
Storrs  
Vleck  
Waller  
Starr

**Absent**

Chamberlain  
Wright

**Also Present:**

Mark Miller, Planning Director  
Susan Lancaster, Assistant City Attorney  
Doug Smith, Real Estate and Development Director  
Brent Savidant, Principal Planner  
Jordan Keoleian, Student Representative

RESOLUTION

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Waller

RESOLVED, that Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Wright be excused from attendance at this meeting.

**Yeas**

All Present (7)

**Absent**

Chamberlain  
Wright

MOTION CARRIED

2. MINUTES

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Pennington

RESOLVED to approve the April 23, 2002 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as corrected.

Yeas  
All Present (7)

Abstain

Absent  
Chamberlain  
Wright

MOTION CARRIED

## RESOLUTION

Moved by Starr

Seconded by Storrs

RESOLVED to approve the May 7, 2002 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as corrected.

Yeas  
Storrs  
Kramer  
Starr  
Waller  
Littman  
Vleck

Abstain  
Pennington

Absent  
Chamberlain  
Wright

MOTION CARRIED

3. BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS REPORT

No report presented.

4. DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY REPORT

Doug Smith stated that they did meet this month and the conference center for Troy was the primary topic on the agenda. We revisited the need for conference

center. On June 19, 2002, there will be an all day meeting with the intent of bringing in three experts in the morning to go over the growth and decline of suburban America. In the afternoon we will give some direction on the economic feasibility of the center. The staff provided a full analysis of the feasibility of the conference center.

Mr. Littman asked if the studies stated it is or isn't needed.

Mr. Smith stated that both studies say it's advisable for a conference center here, it's the size that's in dispute. The DDA looked at a lot of numbers and spreadsheets. They are looking at a 250,000 square foot conference center.

Mr. Littman stated that he doubted if it will happen given that some people are now looking at the Silverdome as a potential site for a conference center.

## 5. CURRENT DEVELOPMENT REPORT

Mr. Smith stated that real estate generally is one of the last economic indicators to recover from recession. We are faced with some pretty significant numbers in vacancies that we haven't seen in years. Most of the brokers feel we are in for a long year in terms of office vacancies.

Mr. Kramer asked if there is any discussion with the Downtown Development Authority on increasing the district by adding the Maple Road corridor.

Mr. Smith stated he doesn't really know if we can expand the Downtown Development Authority. There have been no serious conversations about that. Expansion of boundaries is pretty difficult to justify. He stated he wasn't sure if the State Act's requirements could be met.

Mr. Kramer made the comment of borderline deterioration.

Mr. Littman asked how are the City of Troy's vacancy rates compared to other communities.

Mr. Smith stated that it is around four or five percent. Everybody's rates have come up since the spring of last year. We have fared better than most markets. In general, leases aren't being renewed. There are some pretty big clients whose leases are running out within the next six months. They may be just curtailing some of their business at the moment.

Mr. Kramer asked if it was premature to talk about the Kmart property.

Mr. Smith replied yes.

Mr. Miller stated that he received a letter from Ron Hynd regarding the landscaping at Spectadium and made some phone calls for more information. Mr. Hynd stated that the trees are to be planted by Farbman.

Mr. Miller asked if everyone received the letter he enclosed from Nino Licari regarding right-of-way lines and stated if you read it through it will probably answer most of your questions as to why they seem to move around.

Mr. Miller stated that Mr. Bostick of the Troy Sports Center came to City Management regarding the potential of developing four soccer fields on the north side of and behind the Troy Sports Arena. Direction from the Planning Commission is needed. The property is currently zoned R-EC and commercial recreation is not permitted. The closest district to permit soccer fields is the R-1A through R-1E districts and only golf courses are permitted. The Planning Commission needs to consider whether they want to revise this district to allow this type of use. This direction came from the city staff, who had a meeting with Mr. Bostick.

Mr. Starr asked if it is a temporary permit that we're discussing.

Mr. Miller stated temporary commercial recreation, that includes outdoor grass soccer fields.

Mr. Smith stated that he knew at least two council members who were around when the R-EC rezoning was approved. The adjacent homeowners will have several concerns.

Mr. Storrs stated that as he recalls, Mr. Bostick didn't want to rezone that piece. He stated that he would not be interested in changing the Ordinance.

Mr. Kramer stated he thought R-EC is just fine the way it is.

Mr. Vleck stated that we could take a look at making the Ordinance more uniform.

Mr. Waller stated he would be interested in seeing an analysis as to why the Sports Center thinks this would work for them. He stated we need to clearly address the parking for the site because he is not sure of the requirements. This is a relatively large soccer complex. He stated he could foresee a tournament coming to town. Parking would need to be addressed. Will it require lighting or is it going to be a day operation?

Ms. Pennington stated there are a lot of questions that need to be addressed.

Mr. Keoleian stated that once we start discussing parking and lighting, it's no longer temporary anymore.

Mr. Storrs stated that soccer games get pretty exciting and therefore quite loud. Mr. Vleck stated that what is there right now is not good and it wouldn't hurt to take a look at this proposal.

Mr. Keoleian asked if it was for profit.

Mr. Miller replied yes. He would be renting out the fields.

Mr. Keoleian asked if a senior complex is non-profit.

Mr. Miller stated not necessarily. It depends on the property.

Mr. Miller asked if the Planning Commission was willing to initiate the amendments. He stated that the petitioner could prepare their own amendment and submit it to the Planning Commission for their review.

Mr. Littman stated that the petitioner could come in and state what it is they want.

Mr. Miller stated he would write a letter to them.

Mr. Littman stated that he would keep an open mind if they want to bring us a plan.

Mr. Miller commented on the Section 1 Golf Course for the City and that the application as submitted is not in compliance.

Mr. Storrs asked if we had a site plan on this.

Mr. Miller replied that it must go to City Council for final approval because it is a City project; however, the Planning Commission will need to provide a recommendation to Council.

Mr. Littman asked Mr. Miller to find out who is hauling dirt in and out of this site.

Mr. Waller stated that he discussed with Gary Chamberlain the necessity of obtaining Audobon Society certification. He didn't don't know if he successfully argued the point with City staff. The other concern is the Fonds landfill to the west and asked if a larger problem is being created by developing the golf course.

Mr. Vleck asked if we could get a report of what is going on at the Golf Course.

Mr. Miller stated his concern regarding not receiving any kind of application package from Robertson Brothers regarding the Troy Baptist PUD. He stated the Planning Department likes to have the package thirty (30) days before the meeting. He thought it would not make the June 11 meeting.

Mr. Smith commented on Troy Commons and advised on the Consent Judgment.

Mr. Starr asked why doesn't that strip do well.

Mr. Smith stated perhaps customers are perhaps shopping at big box stores.

Mr. Waller stated that the Wagon Wheel Saloon is blowing out their walls and putting in windows.

Mr. Starr asked if there were any new entrances.

Mr. Smith replied no new drives, this affects value.

## 6. REVISED DESIGN STANDARDS FOR DETENTION BASINS

Mr. Miller stated that at the next City Council meeting six (6) days away, the Revised Standards are going to be presented to City Council by Steve Vandette, City Engineer. Engineering is attempting to make man-made filtering systems. Eventually, this will go to City Council for approval, so if there are any questions or concerns, the Planning Commission should pull them together.

Mr. Miller stated that he would send a request to Steve Vandette, City Engineer, to attend an upcoming special study meeting and explain the standards.

Ms. Pennington stated she would like to hear Mr. Vandette's presentation.

Mr. Starr stated that impacts do occur upstream also.

Mr. Storrs stated these provide additional control from what we have today. Mr. Chamberlain is upset about this going directly to City Council; however, it is only going to City Council for information at this point. He does not think we should do a detailed review at this meeting, however, he noted the draft allows fenced and underground detention that he does not agree with.

Mr. Miller stated probably for determining escrow amounts.

Mr. Kramer stated he would like to have Mr. Vandette come in and talk us through this before we send any of our comments to City Council.

Mr. Vleck stated that clarification needs to be included in certain areas.

Mr. Waller stated we should communicate to the Engineering Department that we can both learn from this. We need a situation where each party works together, in an open and mature discussion.

Ms. Pennington agrees with Mr. Waller and states that she would like to hear the City Engineer's opinion on underground detention.

Mr. Littman stated that he doesn't like fenced detention, however, why couldn't any part that is visible be opaque.

Mr. Savidant stated that see-through fences allow people from outside the fence to look into the detention basin from the street, in case children are playing in the basin or somebody falls into the water.

Ms. Lancaster stated that these are design standards and they can be more vague than ordinance requirements.

## 7. INFILL P.U.D. REVISIONS

Mr. Smith stated that the purpose of a PUD is to allow infill redevelopment. The ten (10) acre PUD requirement is prohibitive and maybe we should create some mechanism to waive that requirement. However, he stated he reread the PUD Ordinance and he feels it is a pretty good ordinance the way it is. We should try to use the PUD in some cases before we start trying to change it.

Mr. Starr stated that the ten (10) acre requirement was an incentive to assemble property.

Ms. Lancaster stated that if there are other communities using the PUDs, that Dick Carlisle or Doug Smith should give us some examples of these smaller PUDs so that we can go look at them.

Mr. Kramer stated that this appears to be spot zoning. We should change our existing Ordinance to five (5) acres rather than making a soft definition of an infill.

Mr. Vleck stated that it makes a lot more sense rezone to PUD when you have an entire development plan. The developer gets some additional flexibility with a PUD but has to meet more stringent requirements. A PUD is better because it let's you see the entire project prior to rezoning.

Mr. Waller agreed with Mr. Vleck. He stated that we need to understand that this is something new for us and we need to proceed slowly. We need to see other examples.

Ms. Pennington stated that the ten (10) acre requirement is not practical. She stated she agreed with Mr. Smith about the possibility of finding a two (2) or three (3) acre parcel that might be appropriate to develop as a PUD.

Ms. Lancaster stated that the verbiage needs to be improved. For example, take land that is going to be blighted and something needs to be done with it. She stated that's where the need for infill comes in. We are going to see more and more of these situations. PUDs are specifically statutorily permitted.

Mr. Miller stated that PUD's are specifically permitted in the City and Village Zoning Act. Our PUD Ordinance requirements relate to our Future Land Use Plan. Mr. Carlisle stated that a PUD is a process, a negotiation tool you use to achieve certain goals and that he and Mr. Smith will work this out and come back to the Planning Commission with their results.

Mr. Storrs asked why even have a minimum lot size requirement.

Mr. Kramer stated shame on us if we are not doing our planning job to have some kind of solution for abandoned property. He stated that we shouldn't use a PUD just to address density or the zoning. We need to ask ourselves what would be needed to improve those areas. We need some type of a plan in place to address a strategy.

Mr. Miller stated that mixed use is not a requirement to have a PUD.

Mr. Littman asked absent the PUD, can you do a mixed use.

Mr. Vleck commented on increasing the setback for PUD's.

Mr. Littman stated that five (5) acres isn't enough land.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No public comments

10. ADJOURN

Meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Miller AICP/PCP  
Planning Director